DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 688 CS 510 213

AUTHOR Chapin, John
TITLE Advertising vs. Public Service Announcements: The Role of Message Type in Safer-Sex Campaigns and Third-Person Perception.
PUB DATE 1999-08-00
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (82nd, New Orleans, LA, August 4-7, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Advertising; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; High Risk Students; Media Research; Public Health; *Sex Education; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS New Jersey; *Public Service Advertising; Safe Sex Practices; *Third Person Effect

ABSTRACT

Fifteen years ago, W. Davison introduced the third-person effect hypothesis, that individuals believe they are less influenced than others by media messages. Although third-person effect is a perceptual bias, Davison believed that individuals act on such misperceptions. Few studies since have tested the behavioral aspect of the third-person effect. In addition, previous studies reporting differences in third-person effect due to message type (i.e. Public Service Announcements (PSAs) vs. advertisements) were controlled to isolate the effects of message type from content and context. The current study sought (1) to document third-person effect among minority "at-risk" youth within the context of safer sex messages; (2) to determine the differences in third-person effects (if any) between PSAs and advertisements with similar content; and (3) to determine the link (if any) between third-person effect and risky sexual behaviors among youth. Subjects were 177 adolescents ranging in age from 8 to 17 enrolled in programs servicing "at-risk" youth in urban New Jersey. Findings indicate that third-person effect is an appropriate framework for understanding how "at-risk" youth perceive safer sex campaigns. The study also confirms the behavioral aspect of third-person effect by linking it with sexual risk behaviors. No difference in third-person effect was found as a result of different message types. Contains 25 references. (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 688

Advertising vs. Public Service Announcements: The Role of Message Type in Safer-Sex Campaigns and Third-Person Perception

John Chapin
Penn State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Chapin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC), New Orleans: August 1999.

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Lisa Henriksen (Stanford University), Robert Kubey (Rutgers University), Linda Steiner (Rutgers University), and Richard Perloff (Cleveland State University) with previous drafts of this paper.

CS 510 213

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Advertising vs. Public Service Announcements: The Role of Message Type in Safer-Sex Campaigns and Third-Person Perception

John R. Chapin, Assistant Professor
Penn State University, Beaver
Ph.D. Rutgers University, 1998

Submitted for presentation at the 1999 AEJMC Convention, Advertising Division

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Lisa Henriksen (Stanford University), Robert Kubey (Rutgers University) and Richard Perloff (Cleveland State University) with previous drafts of this paper.

Jrc11@psu.edu

Penn State University, 100 University Drive, Monaca, PA 15061

Abstract

Fifteen years ago, Davison introduced the third-person effect hypothesis, that individuals believe they are less influenced than others by media messages. Although third-person effect is a perceptual bias, Davison believed that individuals act on such misperceptions. Few studies since have tested the behavioral aspect of the third-person effect. In addition, previous studies reporting differences in third-person effect due to message type (i.e. PSAs vs. advertisements) controls to isolate the effects of message type from content and context. The current study sought (a) to document third-person effect among minority "at-risk" youth within the context of safer sex messages, (b) to determine the differences in third-person effects (if any) between PSAs and advertisements with similar content, and (c) to determine the link (if any) between third-person effect and risky sexual behaviors among youth. Findings indicate that third-person effect is an appropriate framework for understanding how "at-risk" youth perceive safer sex campaigns. The study also confirms the behavioral aspect of third-person effect by linking it with sexual risk behaviors. No difference in third-person effect was found as a result of different message types.

Advertising vs. Public Service Announcements:

The Role of Message Type in Safer-Sex Campaigns and Third-Person Perception

Do adolescents attend to and benefit from safer sex messages? Despite exposure to a multitude of media campaigns, adolescents continue to take sexual risks (CDC, 1997; Donovan, 1997; Nduati & Kiai, 1997). The World Health Report (1998) indicates that 590,000 children and adolescents became infected with HIV in 1997. The report describes HIV/AIDS as one of the biggest 21st-century hazards to children. Although knowledgeable about the transmission of STDs and AIDS (David & So-kum Tang; Nduati & Kiai, 1997), adolescents have not changed their sexual behaviors accordingly (Bok & Morales, 1997; CDC, 1997; David & So-kum Tang, 1997).

The third-person perception (Davison, 1983), the misperception that others are more affected than ones self by media messages, offers an appropriate framework for understanding how adolescents perceive safer-sex campaigns. Davison's conception of the third-person effect included two elements: (a) individuals expect communication to have a greater effect on others than themselves, and (b) the expected impact on others may lead to action in anticipation of the communication effect. Numerous studies offer support for the first hypothesis, but the literature offers less support for the idea that misperception leads to behavior changes.

In previous studies, adolescents have shown resistance to public service announcements due to the stigma associated with social marketing (Duck & Mullin, 1995). It may be the case that their target audience disregards safer-sex campaigns because they are socially undesirable in reference to their specific peer group. If this is

the case, recent advertising campaigns for condoms and home HIV test kits may actually elicit the third-person perception to a lesser degree than PSAs.

The purposes of this study include the following: (a) documenting third-person perception among "at-risk" youth, (b) determining the differences (if any) in third-person perception elicited by PSAs vs. advertisements with similar content, and (c) determining the link (if any) between third-person perception and sexual risk-taking. A sample of minority "at-risk" youth were used because they are frequently the target audience for safer-sex campaigns, yet have been neglected by the majority of third-person perception studies.

First-person perception.

Numerous studies document a "first-person effect" (Atwood, 1994; Duck & Mullin, 1995; Innes & Zeitz, 1988). The first-person perception occurs when individuals believe they are more likely to be affected by the media than are others. In this case, individuals believed they would be more influenced by the drink-driving messages than "the average person." The first- person perception is most likely to emerge when individuals believe a message is socially desirable to peers (Atwood, 1994; Duck & Mullin, 1995; Innes & Zeitz, 1988). Other terms have been used to describe the first-person effect, including "reverse third-person effect" or "optimal impact phenomenon" (Hoorens & Ruiter, 1996).

The first-person perception is an important concept because not all pro-social messages are acceptable to peer groups. For example, Innes and Zeitz' (1988) adult audience indicated being affected by drunk driving PSAs (a first-person effect) because they perceived the message to be socially responsible, but Duck and Mullin's (1995b)

adolescent audience reported no influence of drunk driving PSAs (a third-person effect) because the same topic was considered "nerdy" to that peer group.

The majority of third-person perception studies have used negative messages (defamatory news coverage, negative political advertisements, and pornography). Perloff (1993) concludes his review with the recommendation that pro-social messages are used to study third-person effect, stating that if the third-person perception emerged from these messages, researchers could have more confidence in the generality of the effect. Since the review's publication, Duck and associates (1995) studied Magic Johnson's public statement about his HIV status, and Duck & Mullin (1995) studied televised drinking and driving messages, both finding that positive messages also elicit the third-person perception. The current study addresses this critique by studying third-person perception in the context of prosocial messages.

Predicting Third-Person Perception

Hoorens and Ruiter (1996) argue that the third- person effect is only relevant for socially undesirable topics. A small sample of university students demonstrated a "classic" third person-effect for messages including weapon industry trade, preparation of alcoholic cocktails and extreme right-wing political parties. However socially desirable messages, including traffic safety, crime prevention, and environmental protection produced first-person effects (Hoorens & Ruiter, 1996). Gunther and Mundy (1993) reported similar findings. Price, Huang, and Tewksbury (1997) go as far as claiming that third-person perceptions are most common when messages are associated with negative (or socially undesirable) outcomes.

Message type.

The traditional mass media (radio, television and print media) differentiate between types of messages in format, clearly demarcating advertisements, news, entertainments, and public service announcements (Straubhaar & LaRose, 1997). Two message types that have been shown to predict differences in third-person perception are public service announcements (PSAs) and advertisements (Duck & Mullin, 1995; Gunther & Thorson, 1992; Innes & Zeitz, 1988).

Innes and Zeitz (1988) surveyed 171 Australian adults to assess the extent of third-person perception in three contexts: (a) perceived effects of political advertisements, (b) perceived effects of violence in entertainment shows in the media, and (c) perceived effects of PSAs designed to stop people from drinking and driving. Consistent with the third-person perception hypothesis, Innes and Zeitz reported significant differences between self and others for all three contexts. In addition, third-person perception varied by message type. The greatest degree of third-person perception emerged with respect to violence in entertainment, the next highest with respect to political advertisements, and the least with respect to the PSAs. In reference to the anti-drinking and driving campaign, first-person effects emerged. People believed they were more influenced than others were by the PSAs. Innes and Zeitz (1988) attributed the varying degrees of third-person perception to social desirability, with socially undesirable messages eliciting third-person perceptions and socially desirable messages eliciting first-person effects. Because the context of the messages varied greatly, no conclusions could be made regarding message type (advertisements vs. PSAs vs. entertainment programming).

Gunther and Thorson (1992) more directly contrasted third-person perception elicited from advertisements and PSAs, using an experimental design. Twenty-nine American college students were exposed to 12 messages: four emotion-inducing advertisements (Quantas Airlines, Betty Crocker, Gulf gasoline, Crystal Ice Cream), four neutral advertisements (Fishers Bacon, McDonalds, Glade Air Freshener, Finis furniture polish), and four PSAs (Greenpeace, US Savings Bonds, drinking and driving, United Negro College Fund). The college students exhibited the highest first-person effects in conjunction with the public service announcements, and less for emotional advertisements. Neutral advertisements elicited third-person perceptions. Gunther and Thorson attributed variance in third-person perception to social desirability and intentionality: Both neutral and emotional advertisements elicited different perceived effects on self and others, but PSAs produced no such difference.

Duck and Mullin (1995) also found a difference in third-person perception with regard to public service announcements and entertainment programming, reporting that Australian college students perceived PSAs as having more influence on them than other programming. Duck and Mullin concluded that third-person perception was not a universal response to the issue of social influence, but varied by comparative social contexts and the nature of the content (positive vs. negative). Although it has been established that pro-social messages elicit first-person perceptions among adults, Duck and Mullin (1995) found that children might reject such messages due to the negative connotations of social marketing.

While these three studies (Duck & Mullin, 1995; Gunther & Thorson, 1992; Innes & Zeitz, 1988) demonstrated variance in third-person perception, the results are

confounded by content (positive vs. negative), context (comparing cakes to gasoline and Greenpeace to drinking and driving campaigns), and message type. All three studies relied on convenience samples, and two relied on their college students who may or may not have been appropriate target audiences of the messages. The current study seeks to avoid these issues by using only pro-social messages with similar content (convincing people to get tested for HIV). Minority "at-risk" youth are an appropriate target audience for the messages and have been neglected in previous studies.

Third-Person Effect and Risk Taking

Although the third-person effect is a theory of perceived influence, it posits that individuals act on their perceptions. For instance, Brickner and associates (1987) reported that condom use is better predicted by women's perception of their risk of pregnancy than by their actual risk. Mutz (1989) found that perceived effects of media coverage of campus protest (against university holdings in South Africa) decreased willingness of administrators to discuss the issue in public. In contrast, Gunther (1991) found no difference in the amount of money experimental subjects were willing to award people defamed by a news story, regardless to the degree of third-person effects. Griswold (1992) reported a negative correlation between third-person perception and voting intentions. These results led Perloff (1993) to conclude that mild support (at best) had been provided to link third-person perception to behavior. As third-person effect research approaches the mid-point of its second decade, four more studies have tested behavioral hypotheses. Morwitz and Pluzinski (1996) found that individuals who perceived being influenced by public opinion polls (first-person effect) were more likely to change their vote than were those who perceived others as being more influenced than

themselves (third-person effect). Using the O.J. Simpson trial and coverage as context, Salwen and Driscoll (1997) reported a relationship between third-person perception, assumptions about O.J.'s guilt, and willingness to restrict the press. Subjects exhibited a strong third-person effect, assuming others were more influenced by trial coverage than they were. However, the assumption of OJ's innocence was also required to predict support for press restrictions. Two additional studies (McLeod, Eveland, & Nathanson, 1997; Rojas, Shah, & Faber, 1996) reported a relationship between third-person perception and the willingness to censor the media.

Extending the behavioral hypothesis

The basic assumption stated in the first third-person perception hypothesis, the belief that one is less influenced by the media than others, may be conceptualized in two ways: individuals overestimate the influence of communication on others, or underestimate the influence of communication on themselves Perloff (1993). Similarly, the current study seeks to extend the concept by suggesting that Davison's (1983) behavioral hypothesis also has another dimension. Just as individuals take action based on their perception of the media's influence on others, they may also fail to take action based on the perception that media messages have no influence on them. A common example of this would be a smoker who reaches for a cigarette after viewing an anti-smoking PSA. The perception of diminished personal influence from the many mediated HIV/AIDS messages may lead "at-risk" youth to the conclusion that such messages are "not for them;" thus, failing to attend to such messages and neglecting to take self-protective measures when engaging in sexual behaviors. This study seeks to contribute to existing knowledge and to extend the behavioral hypothesis by exploring the relationship

between perceived influence of safer-sex messages and sexual risk taking among "at-risk" youth.

Hypotheses

Concerning the existence of the third-person perception among minority, "at risk" youth, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Individuals believe they are less influenced than others by televised safer-sex messages.

Concerning the influence of message type on third-person perception, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 2: The third-person perception will be greater for PSAs than for advertisements.

Concerning the relationship between third-person perception and risk-taking, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 3: Students exhibiting higher degrees of third-person effect will be more likely to report "having ever" taken sexual risks, will report taking sexual risks more frequently in the past 30 days, and will be more likely to report intent to future sexual activity than students exhibiting less or no third-person effect.

Method

Subjects.

Subjects were 177 adolescents ranging in age from 8 to 17 (M = 12.1, SD = 1.9). All of the students were enrolled in three programs servicing "at-risk" youth in urban New Jersey. The sample was 54% female and 92% African-American. Most students

were enrolled in a middle-school program (63%), fewer in a high-school program (20%), and the fewest in an elementary-school program (17%)

Materials.

Various procedures for measuring third-person perception appear throughout the literature. The measure in this study was adapted from Duck and Mullin (1995). Study participants were exposed to four 30 second safer-sex televised messages described below:

> Advertisement 1: (Confide). Latin female is shown shopping with a friend, and later calling Confide for her HIV test results. The slogan (and focus) of the message is "it's time to know."
>
> Advertisement 2: (Confide). Latin male is shown in his car and at work. He calls Confide from home for his HIV test results. The slogan (and focus) of the message is "it's time to know."
>
> PSA 1: (New Jersey Network). Latin female appears in the waiting room of a clinic awaiting her HIV test. She's not sure of her partner and fears she may have been infected. The slogan (and focus) of the message is "it's better to know than to be left in the dark."
>
> PSA 2: (NJN). African-American woman is shown in a local park pushing her child on a swing. The narrator talks about the prevalence of HIV/AIDS among minority women and children. The final shot is the empty swing reinforcing that anyone can get AIDS.

Both of the public service announcements were preceded by the New Jersey Network logo to assist students in identifying them as public service announcements. The advertisements were being broadcast on commercial television during the study period. The PSAs had been broadcast on the New Jersey Network over the past three years. The messages featured young female minority spokespersons which

(a) contradicts the stereotype that HIV/AIDS is a gay male problem and (b) likely increases the relevance to the study sample.

After viewing the messages (in varied order), participants answered questions in the form of: "How much do you think _____ (you, other students in the USA) would be influenced by messages like this?" Responses were in the form of Likert-type scales ranging from "not at all" to "extremely influenced." To test the relationship between third-person perception and risk behavior, a composite measure was created by (a) subtracting the assessment of perceived influence on self from perceived influence on others, and (b) combining the self/other comparisons for all four messages. This method is consistent with existing research (e.g., Duck & Mullin, 1995).

A measure of adolescent risk-taking was also utilized to collect information about sexual activity. Students indicated if they had ever had sex with or without a condom, how many days in the past 30 days they had engaged in either of those behaviors, and if they intended to engage in sexual activity before completion of high school. These items were consistent with standard items from numerous studies of youth health risk behaviors, including Jackson and Henriksen's (1997) study of children and cigarette smoking. Questions about current sexual activity were eliminated for the students in grades 4 and 5.

Procedure.

Data was collected from the children during normal program meeting times on two occasions. Parents and children were briefed at a mandatory program orientation meeting, during which parents signed consent for their child (ren) to participate in the study. Ninety-eight percent of the parents invited consented to the study. Before Session

1, the students were briefed and asked to sign an additional consent letter. Program staff offered another activity for students who did not wish to participate. Ninety-eight percent of the students invited consented to participate. Program counselors were available during each session, but the students used none. All students viewed the first two messages in varied order, completed the third-person perception measure, and provided demographic information. Five months later (Session 2), students were exposed to the last two messages, completed the third-person perception measure, and responded to the risk-taking survey. Approximately 30% of the students left their respective programs between Session 1 and Session 2, resulting in a lower N for some analyses.

Results

Third-person perception among minority "at-risk" youth

Hypothesis 1 predicted that individuals would believe they were less influenced than others by televised safer-sex messages. The positive mean for third-person perception (M = .61, SD = 1.6) indicates that as a group, this was the case. Students exhibited third-person perception, believing they (M = -.24, SD = 1.4) were less influenced than others (M = .47, SD - 2.1) by the safer-sex messages, t (169) = -4.6, p< .001. Specifically, 62.4% of the students exhibited a classic third-person perception (perceived themselves to be less influenced than other students in the USA by the safer-sex messages, 31.3% exhibited a first-person effect (perceived themselves to be more influenced than other students in the USA by the messages), and 6.3% perceived no difference between themselves and other students in the USA in terms of perceived message influence. Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Third-person perception and message type

Hypothesis 2 predicted variance in third-person perception due to message type. Contrary to the prediction, there was no difference in third-person perception with respect to PSAs vs. advertisements used during Session 1, t (169) = -.25, p = .80, or Session 2, t (128) = 1.67, p = .10. The predicted difference also failed to emerge after controlling for age, gender, and program group. Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Instead, the degree of third-person perception was highly correlated across all four messages, α = .60. Previous findings confounded message type with content and context; thus, this study was one of the only to isolate message type as a predictor of third-person perception. The lack of findings here suggests that conclusions about message type made previously should be re-examined and interpreted with caution.

Third-person perception and risk-taking

Hypothesis 3 predicted a relationship between third-person perception and risk-taking. Specifically, it was predicted that students exhibiting higher degrees of third-person perception would be more likely to report "having ever" taken sexual risks, would report taking sexual risks more frequently in the past 30 days, and would be more likely to report intent to future sexual activity than students exhibiting less or no third-person perception.

Slightly more than 25% of the students reported having unprotected sex at least once. The average age of sexually active students was 12. Consistent with the prediction, a small positive relationship was found between third-person perception and unprotected sex; however, only 10% of the variance in unprotected sex was explained by the third-person effect. Recall that fourth and fifth grade students were not asked about

past or present sexual activity, so this finding was based on an N of 96 students. Given a larger sample, a stronger relationship may have been established. There was no relationship between third-person perception and protected sex, frequency of sexual experience in the past 30 days, or intention to engage in sexual activity in the future.

Discussion

The hypotheses tested in this study related to several purposes: (a) Documenting third-person perception among minority "at-risk" youth, (b) assessing the influence of message type on the degree of third-person perception, and (c) testing the behavioral component of third-person effect by gauging the relationship between third-person perception and sexual risk-taking.

While the third-person perception is well documented in the literature today, few previous studies included middle school and/or high school students, and fewer still studied minorities. The neglect of adolescents is especially problematic within the context of safer-sex campaigns because experimentation with sex and the formation of lifelong habits are formed during this time period (Fleming, 1996; Udry & Billy, 1987). The over-reliance on Euro-American samples is problematic as well because adolescents of different races and cultural backgrounds initiate sexual behaviors at different times and for different reasons (Udry, 1988; Udry, Billy & Morris, 1985). This study sought to rectify these problems by selecting minority "at-risk" youth as a sample. Students in the sample exhibited a classic third-person perception, believing themselves to be less influenced by televised safer-sex messages than were others. Support was found for hypothesis 1, indicating that third-person perception is an appropriate framework for understanding how youth perceive public health campaigns. It is important to note that

not all of the students exhibited classic third-person perceptions. Nearly one third exhibited first-person effects, believing themselves to be more influenced by the messages than others. While it is not possible to explain such differences from the current data set, they are a strong indication of cultural differences in the third-person perception that should be the focus of further research.

Although numerous studies found variation in third-person perception by message type, differences between advertisements and PSAs disappeared with more precise controls in the current study. Further research should confirm this finding and use negative content and other contexts to support or reject the current findings.

Finally, risk-behaviors may be looked at in terms of experience with a hazard or as a result of perceptual bias. In what little is known about the behavioral aspects of third-person perception (Griswold, 1992; Gunther, 1991; Mutz, 1989), experience has consistently been shown to predict the strength of the effect. For instance, Atwood (1993) reported that for adults, experience with earthquakes *decreased* third-person perceptions, while frequent exposure to earthquake predictions resulting in no earthquake *increased* third-person perceptions. Because longitudinal data was collected for the current study, the opposite direction may also be considered, that third-person effect resulted in more students having unprotected sex. Additional links must be explored to further consider this possibility: (a) After making the assessment that one is less influenced by safer-sex messages, do individuals pay less attention to such messages under the assumption, "this is not for me"? (b) If one makes such an assumption, would it not follow that individuals forfeit the benefits of the messages? Additional data from the continuation of the current study and others like it may both confirm the behavioral

aspect of third-person perception and the direction of that effect. A promising direction for future research is the possible link between third-person perception, attention to messages, and behavior.

References

Atwood, E. (1994). Illusions of media power: the Third-person effect. Journalism Quarterly, 71(2), 269-281.

Bok, M. & Morales, J. (1998). HIV risk behaviors in youth, adolescents, and young adults. Journal of HIV/AIDS Prevention & Education for Adolescents and Children, 2 (1) 81-96.

Brickner, P. Lawton, A., & Phillibcr, S. (1987). Teenagers' perceived and actual probabilities of pregnancy, Adolescence, 22(86), 475-485.

Centers for Disease Control (1997). National vital statistics system. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

David, C. & So-kum Tang, C. (1998). HIV and AIDS knowledge among high-risk Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong: Implications of a prevention program. Journal of HIV/AIDS Prevention & Education for Adolescents and Children, 2 (1) 5-30.

Davison, W. (1983). The Third-person effect in communication. Public Opinion Quarterly, 47, 1-15.

Donovan, B. (1997). Global sex survey. British Journal of Hospital Medicine, 54(11), 575-8.

Duck, J. & Mullin, B. (1995). The perceived impact of the mass media: reconsidering the Third-person effect. European Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 77-93.

Duck, J., Terry, D., & Hogg, M. (1995). The perceived influence of AIDS advertising: 3rd person effects in the context of positive media content, Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17 (3), 305-325.

Fleming, M. (1996). Healthy youth 2000: Amid-decade review. Chicago: Department of Adolescent Health & the American Medical Association.

Gunther, A. (1991). What we think others think: cause and consequence in the third person effect. Communication Research, 18(3), 355-372.

Gunther, A. & Mundy, P. (1993). Biased optimism and the Third-person effect. Journalism Quarterly, 70(1), 58-67.

Gunther, A. & Thorson, E. (1992). Perceived persuasive effects of product commercials and public service announcements: Third-person effects in new domains. Communication Research, 19(5), 574-596.

Hoorens, V. & Ruiter, S. (1996). The optimal impact phenomenon: Beyond the 3rd person effect. European Journal of Social Psychology, 26(4), 599-610.

Innes, J. & Zeitz, H. (1988). The public's view of the impact of the mass media: A test of the "Third-person effect." European Journal of Social Psychology, 18, 457-463.

Mcleod, D., Eveland, W., & Nathanson, A. (1997). Support for censorship of violent and misogynic rap lyrics: An analysis of the third-person effect. Communication Research, 24(2), 153-174.

Morwitz, V. & Pluzinski, C. (1996). Do polls reflect opinions or do opinions reflect pools? The impact of political polling on voters' expectations, preferences, and behavior. Journal of Consumer Research, 23(1), 53-68.

Mutz, D. (1989). The influence of perceptions of media influence: Third-person effects and the public expression of opinions, International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 1(1), 3-23.

Nduati, R. & Kiai, W. (1997). Communicating with adolescents about AIDS. New York: IDRC.

Perloff, R. (1993). 3rd person effect research 1983-1992: A review and synthesis, International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 5(2), 167-184.

Rojas, H., Shah, D., & Faber, R. (1996). For the good of others: Censorship and the third-person effect. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 8 (2), 164-186.

Salwen, M. & Driscoll, P. (1997). Consequences of third-person perception in support of press restrictions in the O.J. Simpson trial, Journal of Communication, 47(2), 60-78.

Straubhaar, J. & LaRose, R. (1997). Communications media in the information society, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Udry, J. & Billy, J. (1987). Initiation of coitus in early adolescence. American Sociological Review, 52, 841-855.

World Health Report (1998). Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.